BOARD OF FOREIGN MISSIONS, R. C. A.
25 EAST 22nd STREET, NEW YORK

Church Union News and Views

Organ of the Continuation Committee

of the

South India Joint Committee on Union

Vol. I JANUARY 1931 No. 4

CONTENTS

		Page
1.	**EDITORIAL**	
	GOD'S STRONG RIGHT HAND	... 131
	JOINT COMMITTEE, MADRAS	... 132
	ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE, DELHI	... 133
2.	**ARTICLES**	
	UNION REPORT	... 133
	WHAT HAPPENED AT TRANQUEBAR?	... 144
	LAMBETH REPORT—SELECTIONS	... 146
	ROUND TABLE CONFERENCE, DELHI	... 154
3.	**BOOK REVIEWS**	... 162
4.	**CLIPPINGS**	... 166

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY FOR INDIA
Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras
1931

The Christian Literature Society for India

Post Box 501, Park Town, Madras

Books on Church Union in South India

	Price Rs	A
IN ENGLISH		
THE PROPOSED SCHEME OF UNION		
Prepared by the Joint Committee on Union ..	0	4
CHURCH UNION—An Indian View.		
By Dr. A. J. Appasamy	0	4
CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA—The Story of the Negotiations.		
By the Bishop of Madras—S. P. C. K.	1	8
THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM—A survey of the present position.		
Edited by Sir James Marchant, K.B.E, LL.D.—CASSELL.	5	0
LAUSANNE, LAMBETH AND SOUTH INDIA—Notes on the present position of the Reunion Movement.		
By N. P. Williams, D.D.—S. P. C. K.	1	14
IN TAMIL		
SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED—Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union ..	0	4
IN TELUGU		
SCHEME OF UNION EXPLAINED—Published under the authority of the Joint Committee on Union ..	0	4

SPECIAL INTERCESSION
AND
PRAYERS FOR UNITY

Issued by the Continuation Committee

Available in English and in Tamil

Price, Rs 2-8-0 per 100

CHURCH UNION

News and Views

Editorial Board

THE LORD BISHOP OF MADRAS — REV. J. S. M. HOOPER, M.A.
K. T. PAUL, ESQ., B.A., O.B.E. — REV. J. J. BANNINGA, D.D. (*Managing Editor.*)

Publishers

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY, PARK TOWN, MADRAS.

Vol. I **JANUARY 1931** **No. 4**

Editorial

God's Strong Right Hand

At the Round Table Conference on Church Union held in Delhi from November 18-20, 1930, the devotional exercises one morning were conducted by the Rev. John Drake of Saharanpur. He took as his subject the quotation from a German Christmas card which he had received from a friend on which the following text from Luther's translation of verse 10 of Psalm lxxvii was found :—

Die rechte hand des Höchsten kann alles ändern (the right hand of the Most High can change all things).

Mr. Drake made a careful study of the original of the text as well as its English translation which reads 'I will remember the years of the right hand of the Most High'. Both are legitimate translations. The word for 'years' is really the Hebrew word for 'change'.

Mr. Drake then went on to speak of the task before us of trying to unite into one body groups of people as far remote as Anglicans and American Methodists, Quakers and United Presbyterians, English Baptists and Dunkard Brethren and reminded us that no matter how great the task was there was a power available which was equal to the task. The right hand of the Most High changes all things and therefore if we place ourselves in line with that power God Himself can through us change all

the problems and the difficulties which we face into means of blessing so that the Church that will result through the co-operation of God and His people will be much stronger and better than any Church that does not completely fulfil the will of God that all His people should be one. Mr. Drake has done us all a great service by calling to our attention this great truth that God can change all things,—even us.

The Meeting of the Joint Committee on Union

A meeting of the Joint Committee on Union consisting of representatives from the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the South India United Church and the Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church met in Madras from November 11-15. There were several new members of the Committee present. Among these were the following:—from the S.I.U.C., Revs. J. E. Kesari, A. H. Legg, R. Robertson and M. S. Taylor; from the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the Bishop of Nasik, the Rev. W. E. S. Holland and Rev. Dr. A. J. Appasamy; from the Wesleyan Methodist Church, Rev. C. W. Posnett, Rev. M. B. Taylor and Mr. W. H. Warren.

It soon became evident after the opening of the meeting that all present felt the spirit of fellowship and the spirit of determination to press forward that had been manifest at the former meetings of the Committee. A spirit of deep gratitude was also evident in that God had made union seem more possible than ever before. It was felt that the results of Lambeth with regard to South India had made the way to union easier and though there were elements that seemed to place new difficulties in the way it was felt that even those difficulties could be overcome. For four days the members of the Committee met together for consultation and for prayer, and as a result of the consultations and prayer all felt that we had been drawn much closer together than ever before. The result of the deliberations are found in the report which is contained in this number of *Church Union—News and Views*. But it was perfectly manifest in the minds of every one that there was a most earnest desire to carry out the will of God for union and to find that way to union which was the highest and best for all concerned. Several difficult points that had led to misunderstanding were cleared up. Other points that on the study of the Scheme by those not present at former meetings had shown that the words were not clear were changed so as to meet the objections. A foreword showing some of the principles involved and an appendix showing some of the implications that would follow from the union were adopted. These should make the Scheme much more intelligible to those who have not been present at the discussions. Perhaps the most significant thought that was present in the minds of all was that having set our hand to the plough we must

in no way and for no reason turn back; having been called by God for this high commission nothing on earth should deter us from continuing to go forward in the matter. There is no hurry: there is no impatience: but there is a real determination to find God's way and to follow it.

The Round Table Conference on Church Union in Delhi

From November 18-20 a Round Table Conference was held at Delhi to consider the question of Church Union. A full report will be found in these pages as published in *Dnyanodaya* by the Rev. A. J. Revnell and the Rev. William Hazen. A task of herculean difficulties lies before our North India brethren. It certainly has never happened before in the whole history of the Christian Church that ten bodies of such a large variety of thought and practice have come together to consider the question of uniting into one organic body. The faith of our North India brethren is commendable, and the spirit in which they are approaching the task is likewise commendable. They too have seen the vision and they too realise the source of power that will enable them to make the vision real. The centre of interest in the Church Union Movement may now change from South India to the whole of India, but it may be safely anticipated that throughout the world all who are interested in this subject will be glad to see the broadening of the issues involved and the strengthening of the forces engaged in solving them. We congratulate the Churches in North India upon their vision and upon their faith. May God lead them to the complete realisation of their highest ideals.

REPORT OF THE NINTH SESSION

OF THE

JOINT COMMITTEE ON UNION

MADRAS

Nov. 12—15, 1930.

The Joint Committee on Union met at the Wesleyan Synod Hall, Madras, from Wednesday, November 12 to Saturday, November 15, 1930.

The following members were present:—

Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. The Bishop of Dornakal (Convener), the Bishops of Madras and Nasik, the Archdeacon of Jaffna, the Rev. Canon B. H. P. Fisher, the Revs. T. E. T. Shore, J. B. Gnanavolivu, P. B. Emmet, W. E. Evans, W. E. S. Holland, John Kuriyan and Dr. A. J. Appasamy.

South India United Church. The Rev. Dr. J. J. Banninga (Convener), the Revs. A. T. Foster, J. E. Kesari, A. H. Legg, J. H. Maclean, R. Robertson, M. S. Taylor, H. Sumitra, Meshach Peter and Messrs. C. J. Lucas and Paul Daniel.

Wesleyan Methodist Church. The Rev. J. S. M. Hooper (Convener), the Revs. C. H. Monahan, C. W. Posnett, W. E. Tomlinson, S. M. Devadass, N. G. Ponnaiya, W. A. Sandford, P. S. Rengaramanujam, M. B. Taylor, P. Gurushanta and Messrs. S. Gnanapragasam, W. Jeevaratnam and W. H. Warren.

The Rev. H. Sumitra was appointed Chairman for the session.

The Revs. W. E. Evans and N. G. Ponnaiya were appointed Minute Secretaries of the session.

The Rev. Dr. J. J. Banninga was appointed Secretary of the Joint Committee.

Devotional services were conducted each day by the following members: Rev. H. Sumitra, Rev. W. A. Sandford, Rev. M. S. Taylor, and the Bishop of Nasik.

The Late Rev. V. Santiago. The Committee passed the following resolution, standing:—

'The Committee records with regret the news of the death of the Rev. V. Santiago, since its last meeting in March, 1929. As one of the prime movers of the Tranquebar Conference, as Chairman of the Joint Committee at two of its sessions and as a faithful member of the Joint Committee at all its meetings, Mr. Santiago has rendered a memorable service for the cause of union in South India. The Committee thanks God for the life and work of Mr. Santiago and desires the Secretary to convey this resolution to the members of his family.'

FOREWORD

(Approved by the Joint Committee in general and referred to the Continuation Committee for final wording and adoption.)

We believe that God wills union and that the union which is according to His will is not merely the friendliness which must necessarily exist between those who share deep spiritual ideals but a definite union in one body, which shall be a living witness to God and our Saviour Jesus Christ and the instrument whereby He will work out His eternal purposes in the world.

We therefore believe that this union cannot be fully realized so long as competing or separately organized Churches remain in any one area. We humbly believe that God has led the movement for organic union in South India ever since it was inaugurated at Tranquebar in 1919 and we believe that we must go forward till His purpose is achieved and that no matter what differences of opinion may appear we must work until we find the solution of all our problems and come into that union which He desires.

But we do not regard agreement on the constitution of a united Church as the final goal or indeed as the most important thing in our movement. God has lavished wisdom and care on every detail of even the smallest organism which He has created and has wonderfully ordered His world as the sphere in which His redeemed shall live and work for His glory: and He will not be honoured by us if we are careless in our efforts to learn His will and to obey His purpose that His Body, the Church, shall be fitly framed together and that every joint shall supply that which, through it, He purposes to give to men. Organization, therefore, there must be and it must be as perfect as we can make it. Nevertheless, we believe that this movement for Church Union is essentially a spiritual and evangelistic movement. We cannot but believe that as the Spirit was poured out upon the disciples when they were gathered all together in the upper room in prayer, so the Spirit will again be poured out on us when we come into that

union which we are assured is in accordance with His will. We are confident that only by union will be realized those mighty spiritual forces which will deepen our life in Him, enkindle our zeal and increase our power for the evangelization of India. It is in that confidence that we can go forward and try to build up a union in organization. But, we repeat it, the organization is not the final goal.

We believe that after union the Church will be a spiritual home for all those who have hitherto lived and worshipped in separation. We fully realize that there are differences of belief, of practice and of tradition but we are firmly convinced that the members of the uniting Churches will bring into the common life and organization of the united Church whatever of value they have learned in their separate organizations.

The Episcopate, the Councils of Presbyters and the Congregation of the faithful all had their place in the constitution of the early Church : and all these have been the basis of the government of great communions in Christendom. The preservation of these three elements in its organization is essential to the good order of the Church. The uniting Churches will bring their experience of these systems, learned in separation, into our common life and we believe that in the fellowship of the united Church these elements will each find their proper and effective place and be a permanent enrichment of its life. They will, of course, necessarily modify one another by mutual inter-action, but together will make for a fuller and more effective organization than each can be in isolation. For the united Church will be a fellowship and in that fellowship we believe that every member will find such a spiritual atmosphere that he can worship God with added devotion and serve men with enlarged powers and opportunities. All those who enter into this fellowship will be brethren in their Father's house and in order that we may all be prepared to live in that brotherhood, let us earnestly pray for the spirit of brotherly love. In that brotherly spirit let respect and honour for all men prevail among us : in that spirit let us do all that in us lies to share with each other all that God has given us by way of revelation and enlightenment.

REPORTS

Reports of action taken by each of the Churches since the date of the last session were made by the Conveners.

The Rev. Dr. J. J. Banninga explained the relationship of the General Assembly to the Church Councils and read out the questions transmitted by the Assembly to the Councils for their consideration and report. As the Councils had not yet all reported to the Committee on Union these resolutions did not all come before the Joint Committee for action.

It was then resolved that the resolutions of the Wesleyan Synod and of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon be considered by the Joint Committee *seriatim*.

The Bishop of Dornakal presented the resolutions of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon and the Rev. J. S. M. Hooper those of the Wesleyan Provincial Synod.

(These suggestions were discussed, debated, referred to sectional meetings, or special committees, and finally submitted to a drafting committee which brought each resolution before the Joint Committee which then considered it, modified it and adopted it. The resolutions of the Joint Committee are here presented not in the order in which they were adopted but in the order in which the changes occur in 'The Proposed Scheme of Union.' In general the suggestion of one of the negotiating Churches is given in italics, then the action of the Joint Committee is given, after which the section of the Proposed Scheme is given in a complete paragraph so that it can be seen at a glance just what changes were made by the Joint Committee at this session. The full Minutes of the Meeting,

giving all details of action and also of debates, may be seen with the Conveners of the Committees appointed by the three Churches.)

Ang. = Anglican, the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.
Wes. = South India Provincial Synod of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.
S.I.U.C. = General Assembly of the South India United Church.

Ang. 1 (a) That the wording of Section III A, para. 4 be modified to bring it into consonance with the language of the Anglican Church when it declares the two Sacraments 'generally necessary to salvation.'

Resolution 1. That the following words be substituted for para. 4 of Sec. III A.

They believe that the Sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord are means of grace through which God works in us and that while the mercy of God to all mankind cannot be limited, there is in the teaching of Christ the plain command that men should follow His appointed way of salvation by a definite act of reception into the family of God and by continued acts of fellowship with Him in that family and that this teaching is made explicit in the two Sacraments which He has given us and they agree that they should be ministered in the united Church with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordained by Him.

Ang. 11. That among the duties of presbyters that of seeking to bring sinners to repentance and forgiveness through the ministry of reconciliation be included.

Resolution 2. That in Section III para 5, line 4 after the words: 'their vocation is' be inserted the words: 'to bring sinners to repentance'.

Ang. 1 (b) That the words should be revised in para. 5 so that it shall be sufficiently clear that the unworthiness of the minister does not hinder the effect of the Sacrament.

Resolution 3. That at the end of para. 5 of Section III A the words: 'which grace if humbly used will enable the ministers to perform the same' be omitted.

The paragraph, with these two changes will read as follows:—

They believe that the Ministry is a gift of God through Christ to His Church; that God Himself calls men into the Ministry through His Holy Spirit, and that their vocation is to bring sinners to repentance, and to lead God's people in worship, prayer, and praise, and through pastoral ministrations, the preaching of the Gospel and the administration of the Sacraments (all these being made effective through faith) to assist men to receive the saving and sanctifying benefits of Christ and to fit them for service; and they believe that in ordination God, in answer to the prayers of His Church, bestows on and assures to those whom He has called and His Church has accepted for any particular form of the Ministry, a commission for it and the grace appropriate to it.

Wes. 1 (i). That there should be a more definite and explicit statement that it is not the intention of the Scheme that Apostolic Succession shall be a doctrine of the Church.

The recommendation of the S.I.U.C. and the instructions of the General Council on the same subject were also read.

Resolution 4. That in Section III B. first para., the words, 'without intending thereby to imply or to express a judgment on any theory concerning episcopacy' be omitted and after a full stop, the following be substituted: 'But this acceptance does not bind the united Church to the acceptance of any particular theory concerning episcopacy, either as a qualification for the ministry, or as a determining factor in its relations with other Churches.'

The uniting Churches, recognizing that the episcopate, the councils of the presbyters and the congregation of the faithful must all have their appropriate places in the order of life of the united Church, accept in particular the historic episcopate in a constitutional form as part of their basis of union. But this acceptance does not bind the united Church to the acceptance of any particular theory concerning episcopacy, either as a qualification for the ministry, or as a determining factor in its relations with other Churches.

Wes. (2). That by agreeing 'that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an espiscopally ordained minister,' we do not thereby cease to recognize the validity of the ministry of non-episcopal Churches.

Resolution 5. That the following words be added to Section III B. 4 (p. 5) 'The uniting Churches declare that in making this provision it is their intention and determination in this manner to secure the unification of the ministry, but that the acceptance of this provision does not involve the denial of the validity or regularity of any other form of ministry.'

The paragraph will then read as follows:—

(4) every ordination of presbyters shall be performed by the laying on of hands of the bishop and presbyters, and all consecrations of bishops shall be performed by bishops, not less than three taking part in each consecration. The uniting Churches declare that in making this provision it is their intention and determination in this manner to secure the unification of the ministry, but that the acceptance of this provision does not involve the denial of the validity or regularity of any other form of the ministry.

It was also pointed out that in III C (i) para. second 'all other ministers' should read 'all other ordained ministers.'

Resolution 6. That the para. be revised to read as follows:—

and that all the other ordained ministers of the uniting Churches in the area of the union shall be acknowledged as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the united Church, provided they assent to the Basis of Union and accept the Constitution of the united Church. Similarly, subject to the same provision, Deacons and Probationers shall retain in the united Church the status they had in their own Churches before the union.

Ang. 6 (b). That the word "and expectation" should be omitted and the word "temporary" be substituted for "such" in Section IV B. 6.

Resolution 7. That in Sec. IV B. 6. instead of the word 'such' the words 'any further temporary' be substituted, and that the following words be added to the end of the para. :—'provided the status of those already received as ministers shall not thereby be affected'.

The paragraph will then read as follows :—

For the thirty years succeeding the inauguration of the union, the ministers of any Church whose missions have founded the originally separate parts of the united Church may be received as ministers of the united Church, if they are willing to give the same assent to the Basis of Union and the same promise to accept the Constitution of the united Church as will be required from persons about to be ordained or employed for the first time in that Church. After this period of thirty years, the united Church will consider and decide the question of any further temporary exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry, provided that the status of those already received as ministers shall not thereby be affected.

Ang. 7 (b). That in Section IV. C, any phrase which might seem to suggest a breaking of communion between the Southern Dioceses entering the union and the other dioceses should disappear from the final form of the Scheme.

Resolution 8. That in Section IV C, para. 1, lines 8, 9, the words 'the absence of any organic union with the Northern Province' be omitted and these words substituted in their place—'this severance from the organization of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon'.

The paragraph would then read as follows :—

It is proposed that the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon should divide itself into two provinces in order to allow the Southern Province, consisting of the dioceses of Madras, Tinnevelly, Travancore and Dornakal (and if the union extends to Ceylon, Colombo) to form with the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyan Church in South India an autonomous united Church in South India (and Ceylon), this severance from the organization of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon being accepted temporarily for the sake of unity, on the clear understanding that the united Church of the South will wish for and will endeavour to promote a similar union in the North and on the conclusion of such a union will seek itself to be united to the Northern Church in an all-India united Church.

Ang. 7 (a). In regard to the relationship of the united Church with the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the following resolutions were passed :—

Resolution 9. (i) The Joint Committee again assure the General Council of the Anglican Church that they are prepared to do anything that is necessary to carry out the Statutory Rules and obligations to 'maintained Churches'.

(ii) The Joint Committee also again assures the Wesleyan Conference that they are prepared to co-operate heartily with the Senior Wesleyan Chaplain in carrying on the work in this area for which he is responsible to Government.

(iii) The Committee further assure the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon that they sincerely hope that not only will the most cordial relations always exist between the two Churches, but that, whenever

suitable occasion arises, there will never be any hesitation about taking common counsel together, but they think that any question of arranging for formal or regular occasions of consultation should be left to the decision of the Church after union.

(iv) The Joint Committee take this opportunity to assure the Wesleyan Church in North India, in Burma and in Ceylon and the Churches in North India, with which the S.I.U.C. is now in fellowship, that the united Church will always be ready and glad to respond to any proposals for common counsel but that the arrangement for formal or regular occasions of such consultation would properly be made by the Church after union.

It was pointed out that in the Functions of the Bishops it had not been said that where the rite of Confirmation was practised he should perform the rite.

Resolution 10. That Section VII A (i) the following addition be made to the words already added in Res. 13: 'As the chief shepherd under Christ of His flock in that part, he is responsible for doing all he can to foster the true spiritual unity of the diocese, by entering as far as possible into personal relation with every member of the flock; especially ministering, as occasion may serve, the rite of Confirmation or by presiding, when desired, at other services in which admission is given into full membership of the Church.'

Ang. 9. That reference should be made in the Scheme to the authority of the Episcopal body to publish pronouncements or instructions on matters of Faith and Order.

Resolution 11. That the following words be added to the end of Section VII, Part I A. (1):—His office is also essentially a teaching office and it is his duty by all means in his power to instruct the ministers and congregations, over whom he has oversight, concerning the truths of the Christian faith.

With these two additions the paragraph will read as follows:—

The Bishop of the diocese has the general pastoral oversight of all the Christian people of the diocese, and more particularly, of the ministers of the Church in the diocese.

As the chief shepherd under Christ of His flock in that part, he is responsible for doing all he can to foster the true spiritual unity of the diocese, by entering as far as possible into personal relation with every member of the flock; especially by ministering, as occasion may serve, the rite of Confirmation or by presiding, when desired, at other services in which admission is given into full membership of the Church.

His office is also essentially a teaching office and it is his duty by all means in his power to instruct the ministers and congregations, over whom he has oversight, concerning the truths of the Christian faith.

S.I.U.C. 7. That in regard to Sec. VII. Part I (A) (3) in case a bishop is not satisfied with the declaration of the faith of a candidate for ordination he should consult the other bishops of the Church before making a decision.

Resolution 12. It is understood that the practice will be continued, after union, of consultation with responsible ministers who have examined the candidate for ordination by the Bishops.

Resolution 13. That the Note on p. 19 at the end of Section VII A. 3 be changed to read as follows:—

In order so far as possible to give uniformity of standard for the ministry of the united Church, general rules for the selection and training of candidates shall be laid down by the Synod.

Resolution 14. That in Sec. VII A. 4, line 7 the words 'who shall consult' be substituted for 'after such consultation'.

The Wesleyan Sectional Committee brought forward a suggestion to amend Sec. VII A (4) with reference to authorizations by Bishops.

Resolution 15 That in Section VII 4, line 4 after the word 'ministers' the words 'at the time of ordination' be inserted and in line 5 after 'diocese' be inserted 'authorizations to other ordained ministers who from time to time come to undertake definite work in the diocese'.

The paragraph will then read as follows :—

(4) The bishop of the diocese, acting in accordance with such rules in the matter as may be laid down in this Constitution or by the Synod, will give, at the time of ordination, authorizations to ministers to officiate and to preach in the diocese, and authorizations to other ordained ministers who may from time to time come to undertake definite work in the diocese. The location of the ministers shall also be carried out by the bishop of the diocese, who shall consult with diocesan committees or other bodies as may be prescribed by the rules of the diocese.

Wes. 1. viii. That there should be, in the written constitution, a clearer definition and limitation of the powers of the Bishop, including his power of veto, and the reception and stationing of ministers.

Resolution 16. That the penultimate paragraph of VIII B (3) of the Scheme (p. 30) be repeated under VII A (7).

The paragraph reads as follows :—

A decision or resolution so held in abeyance may be disposed of by agreement in a subsequent meeting of the Diocesan Council, and if not so disposed of shall be referred to the Synod for settlement.

Wes. 1. viii. That power should be given to a Diocesan Council to express its opinion at regular intervals to the Synod, as to whether it is in the interests of the work of God for its Bishop to continue in office in the Diocese.

Resolution 17. The following paragraph was adopted but the relation of this to clause (11) on p. 21 of the scheme was not considered by the committee at this session.

"When there seems to the Moderator that there is good reason to believe that a Diocesan Bishop is mentally, physically or otherwise incapable of duly discharging the duties of his office, he shall represent the matter to the bishop concerned with a view to securing his resignation ; and, if the bishop refuse to resign, the Moderator may represent the matter to the Synod and take their advice as to his future action. (NOTE.—Rules of procedure for such cases should be included in the constitution of the Church.)

Ang. 10. That when the election of a bishop is confirmed by the Executive Committee a two-thirds majority of all the bishops entitled to vote should be required.

Resolution 18. That Section VII B read as follows :—

Every appointment of a bishop shall be subject to confirmation by the Executive Committee of the Synod, which shall for this purpose include all the Diocesan Bishops. This confirmation shall be by the vote of a majority of the members of the Executive Committee and this majority shall include a two-thirds majority of the bishops present. Such confirmation may not be withheld except when either the election or appointment shall have been proved to have been invalid, or the Executive Committee shall judge the person appointed to be unfit in respect of character, conduct or teaching, to execute the functions of a bishop.

S.I.U.C. That presbyters should take part along with the bishops in all consecrations of bishops.

Resolution 19. That the Joint Committee forward the following statement to the governing bodies of the uniting Churches and wishes them to consider whether it would be right to incorporate this as a note to Section VII, Part I, (B) (7) :—

'In view of the common desire to carry over from the uniting Churches into the United Church all elements which may in any way contribute to the fullest expression of truths which have been valued in the Christian Church, it shall be permissible for Presbyters to join with the Bishops in the laying on of hands at the consecration of a Bishop; provided that it always be remembered and taught that the true Consecrator is God to whom prayer is made.'

Resolution 20. That in Section VII, Part I (C) (2) be inserted : (i) 'to bring sinners to repentance and forgiveness both by the private and public exercise of his ministry' and to renumber the present (i)—(viii) as (ii)—(ix).

The list will then read :—

(i) to bring sinners to repentance and forgiveness both by private and public exercise of their ministry,
(ii) to lead the public worship of the congregation,
(iii) to administer the Holy Communion,
Etc., Etc.

Ang. 12. That in Section IX B. (5) the paragraph should be redrafted.

Resolution 21. That Section IX B. (5) read as given below and the Liturgical Committee be instructed to incorporate the idea into the Service of Holy Communion :—

The Thanksgiving for God's glory and goodness, and the redemptive work of Christ in His birth, life, death, resurrection, and ascension, leading on to a reference to His institution of the Sacrament, in which His own words are rehearsed and to the setting apart of the bread and wine to be used for the purpose of the Sacrament, with prayer that we may receive thereby that which our Lord intends to give us in this Sacrament.

S.I.U.C. 5. That the implications of the provision for Inter-communion in Sec. IV B. 1 be clearly set forth.

Resolution 22. The matter was referred to the Drafting Committee for consideration and report, that such a statement be published as an Appendix to this Report. The Committee reported and the report was adopted (see p. 143).

Resolution 23. The suggestion was made in one of the sessions that it might be well to have a 'Foreword' showing some of the principles involved in our union, which though included have not yet become clear to all who read the Scheme. It was therefore resolved to ask the Continuation Committee to consider such a 'Foreword' and on approval to include it in the Report of this meeting. **(See Foreword, p. 134).**

Wes. I. iv. That there should be a definite statement that no further estimate shall be required of any minister previous to his consecration as a bishop.

In view of the Lambeth Conference opinion it was felt that no further statement was required.

Ang. V. Re Confirmation. In view of the Lambeth Conference Report it was agreed that there was no need for any Resolution on this subject.

S.I.U.C. Recommendations 8 and 9: reading as follows:—

8. That in regard to the powers of the synod, after the bishops have stayed action in the synod, as in Sec. VIII C 7 the matter thus stayed shall be dealt with in accordance with the principles laid down in Sec. XIII-A.

9. That with a view to reassuring those in the Church who are afraid that within a short time after the union the Synod might by a majority take action which would be contrary to the principles which at the time of union belong to one or other of the uniting Churches, it is hereby declared that it is contrary to the intention of those who make the union that any question on which the uniting Churches as such are divided or have differing practices (such as admission to communicant membership) be brought up within 20 years from the date of the union.

Owing to lack of time these points were reserved for the next meeting of the Joint Committee.

Ang. B. (a) The question of adding an explanation of the meaning of the pledge in Section IV B 3 was left over to be considered when editing the Scheme of Union.

OTHER MATTERS

24. *Intercommunion. The Wesleyan delegates presented Res. 3 of the Provincial Synod in regard to Intercommunion. 'In our judgment it will help greatly to increase the spirit of unity between the consulting Churches, and within our own Church to win the mind of our people, if even before union is consummated, united worship and especially intercommunion between the consulting Churches can be made possible. The absence of intercommunion at this time constitutes a most formidable obstacle to union in the minds of many of our people.' Similar opinions were expressed by delegates of the S.I.U.C. also.* The Anglican delegates resolved to communicate this strongly expressed desire to the Metropolitan with a view to see if any action was possible in the Dioceses concerned in the negotiations in this matter.

25. Union Conference in North India. The Committee confirmed the action of the Continuation Committee which had appointed Rev. W. E. Tomlinson and Dr. Banninga, in response to the invitation from North India, to attend as delegates a Round Table Conference on the subject of unity in Delhi on November 18, 1930.

26. Continuation Committee. The Conveners of the three Churches reported that each group had reappointed their representatives to the Continuation Committee. They are:—Mr. K. T. Paul, Rev. J. H. Maclean, and Rev. H. Sumitra for the S.I.U.C.; Rev. W. E. Tomlinson, Rev. N. G. Ponnaiya and Rev.

J. S. M. Hooper for the Wesleyan Church, and the Bishops of Tinnevelly, Madras and Dornakal for the Anglican Church; Dr. Banninga as Secretary of the Joint Committee continues as Convener of the Continuation Committee.

27. Vote of thanks :—

The Committee passed a vote of thanks to the hosts and hostesses, who so kindly arranged for the hospitality of the members during this meeting, and to the Wesleyan authorities for the use of their hall.

		H. SUMITRA,	*Chairman*
Pasumalai,	}	W. E. EVANS,	} *Minute Secretaries*
29—11—30	}	N. G. PONNAIYA,	}
		J. J. BANNINGA,	*Secretary*

APPENDIX

(See Resolution No. 22.)

The implications of the Scheme in relation to communion and intercommunion, with special reference to Section IV. A. (1) and B. (1).

I. Of communicants and ministers in the united Church.

(*a*) Any communicant member of the united Church is at liberty to communicate in any church of the united Church: and any minister of the united Church is at liberty to minister and to celebrate the Holy Communion in any church of the united Church, subject only to the terms of the pledge. Section IV. B. (3).

(*b*) Any communicant member of any Church which is in fellowship with any of the uniting Churches is at liberty to communicate in any church of the united Church.

(*c*) Any minister of the united Church is at liberty to minister and to celebrate the Communion in any church of a Church with which any of the uniting Churches enjoys relations of fellowship, if he is invited to do so.

(*d*) Any minister of a Church with which the united Church has relations of fellowship, is at liberty to minister or to celebrate the Holy Communion in any church of the united Church, if he is invited to do so, subject to the provisions of the pledge for the protection of conscientious scruples. Section IV. B. (3).

II. Of intercommunion with other Churches.

(*a*) It is understood that the fellowship which exists between the uniting Churches and other Churches at present is not intended to be merely temporary but is to be a permanent fellowship, leading, it is hoped, to a worldwide union of the Church.

(*b*) It is expected that all the Churches with which the united Church has relations of communion and fellowship will be willing to receive any communicant member of the united Church to communion as a visitor in any of their churches.

(*c*) It is understood that any member of the united Church proposing to acquire permanent membership in any other Church will be expected to comply with the rules of that Church (*e.g.* as regards Confirmation in Churches which require it).

(*d*) It is understood that any minister of the united Church proposing to celebrate the Holy Communion or to minister in any church of a Church with which the united Church is in communion and fellowship, will be bound by the regulations of that Church in regard to his ministrations, in the same way as the ministers of that Church are bound.

What happened in Tranquebar in 1919

So much has sprung out of the first meeting on union held in Tranquebar in the year 1919 and so much has been written, surmised and suspected about it that it is time we stated actual facts for the information of the Churches.

It was at Jubbulpore, at a meeting of the National Missionary Council that the idea first occurred to two or three of the Indian representatives from South India that Indian ministers should be given an opportunity of meeting by themselves to discuss possibilities of Church Union. The character of the Council in those days was missionary. This fact and the exclusion of the subject of union from the purview of that Council contributed to such thoughts.

The private conference called by Bishop Whitehead in 1910, and the correspondence between the Bishop of London and the Wesleyan Churches in England may have been in the background of our thoughts; but they were not the immediate occasions of the Tranquebar Conference.

One of the Indians was the late Rev. V. Santiago. He and others decided that I should, as Convener of the Committee, of the National Missionary Council, on the Indian Church, send out the invitation. We had however no money to finance such a Conference. Just then we found that a Conference of South Indian Ministers was to be held in Tranquebar by the Rev. H. A. Popley, then Evangelistic Forward Movement Secretary for South India. On approaching Mr. Popley he assured us that if we could have the Union Conference on the two days succeeding the Evangelistic Forward Movement Conference, he had private funds from which he could meet the entertainment charges for the additional days. We agreed; and it was this circumstance that led to our inviting Mr. Eddy who was taking some of the meetings at the Evangelistic Conference and Mr. Popley to stay on as visitors.

The Convener then got into touch with responsible leaders of the Churches represented at the Conference so that they might nominate one of their ministers to present a paper to this Union Conference. They were asked definitely to deal with the question propounded:—

1. What do you think to be the distinctive features of the organization and the religious teaching and practice of your own Church?
2. Should a united Indian Church come into being, what do you consider to be the features that ought to be your contribution to that Church, and which in fairness to your traditions, you ought not to give up, without serious loss to the full life of the Church?

3. What is the attitude of your Church towards union with other Churches?

Four speakers were thus appointed—Wesleyan, Lutheran, S.I.U.C. and Anglican. The papers were taken up in that order. A session of three hours being allotted to each paper and discussion thereon. The plan of the meeting was this. After a Devotional address taken by Mr. Eddy, the presentation of the papers began. The Chairman first called upon the appointed speaker to give his address. Then, any member of the same Church was given time to supplement or correct anything that had been said on behalf of that Church. After that, the representatives of the other Churches were given an opportunity to ask questions to obtain fuller elucidation of the subject. Here it must be stated that while the men were appointed by some responsible person belonging to each Church, the appointment was not done officially and the Churches themselves had no responsibility in regard to the contents of the papers.

The Wesleyan paper came first. It was very full of information, but the two Wesleyan ministers present were not able to speak with any knowledge in regard to the question of union. The Lutheran paper came next and was by the local pastor, ably seconded by one of the local missionaries. It avowed frankly the Lutheran position that union except on Lutheran doctrinal position would be betraying the Lutheran trust, and that their Church did not consider organic union on any other basis as a desirable ideal. The S.I.U.C. paper was by the Rev. M. Peter of Vellore, supplemented by others. The Anglican position had to be presented by myself.

On the second evening, after the Anglican position was fully described, several of the S.I.U.C. ministers felt that the elements of episcopacy for which the Anglicans seemed to stand were precisely the elements that were needed for the S.I.U.C. system; and the Anglican representatives felt equally the desirability of being organically one with a Church which had so strongly manifested individual freedom, the service of the laity and evangelistic zeal. The representatives of these two Churches therefore stayed on for part of the third day and, after various group meetings, issued the now famous Tranquebar Manifesto—in the drafting of which both Mr. Eddy and Mr. Popley helped a great deal.

This frank and full narration has been made because of the many mistaken assumptions and criticisms made in regard to the origin of the South India Union Movement. It is a genuinely Indian Movement, and has had its springs in a passionate desire for pooling the spiritual heritages of these divided Churches, for the furtherance of the kingdom of God among the Indian Christians and Non-Christians in South India.

V. S. DORNAKAL.

Extracts from the Resolution of the Lambeth Report

(*Continued from November*)

III.—The Unity of the Church, South India

40 (*a*) The Conference has heard with the deepest interest of the proposals for Church Union in South India now under consideration between the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the South India United Church and the Wesleyan Methodist Church of South India, and expresses its high appreciation of the spirit in which the representatives of these Churches have pursued the long and careful negotiations.

(*b*) The Conference notes with warm sympathy that the project embodied in the proposed Scheme for Church Union in South India is not the formation of any fresh Church or Province of the Anglican Communion under new conditions, but seeks rather to bring together the distinctive elements of different Christian Communions, on a basis of sound doctrine and Episcopal order, in a distinct Province of the Universal Church, in such a way as to give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought and the life of the Church Universal.

(*c*) We observe, further, as a novel feature in the South Indian Scheme, that a complete agreement between the uniting Churches on certain points of doctrine and practice is not expected to be reached before the inauguration of the union; but the promoters of the Scheme believe that unity will be reached gradually and more securely by the interaction of the different elements of the United Church upon one another. It is only when the unification resulting from that interaction is complete, that a final judgment can be pronounced on the effect of the present proposals. Without attempting, therefore, to pronounce such judgment now, we express to our brethren in India our strong desire that, as soon as the negotiations are successfully completed, the venture should be made and the union inaugurated. We hope that it will lead to the emergence of a part of the Body of Christ which will possess a new combination of the riches that are His. In this hope we ask the Churches of our Communion to stand by our brethren in India, while they make this experiment, with generous goodwill.

(*d*) The Conference thinks it wise to point out that, after the union in South India has been inaugurated, both ministers and lay people of the United Church, when they are outside the jurisdiction of that Church, will be amenable to the regulations of the Province and Diocese in which they desire to officiate or to worship, and it must be assumed that those

regulations will be applied to individuals in the same manner as they would now be applied to similarly circumstanced individuals, unless any Province takes formal action to change its regulations.

(*e*) The Conference, fully assured in the light of the resolutions of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon adopted in February, 1930, that nothing will be done to break the fellowship of the Churches of the Anglican Communion, confidently leaves in the hands of the Bishops of that Church the task of working out in detail the principles which are embodied in the proposed Scheme.

(*f*) The Conference gives its general approval to the suggestions contained in the Report of its Committee with regard to the proposed Scheme for Church Union in South India, and commends the Report to the attention of the Episcopal Synod and General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.

The Church in Persia

41. The Conference has heard with deep sympathy of the steps towards union which have been proposed in Persia; it desires to express its sincere appreciation of the missionary zeal of the Church in Persia, and it generally approves the sections in the Report of its Committee dealing with this subject.

From the Committee's Report: Steps towards Union in Persia

We have received the Proposals for a United Church of Persia as approved by the Inter-Church Conference held at Isfahan, July 23rd, August 5th, 1927.

We rejoice to hear of the growth of this young Church in a Moslem land, and its zeal in the evangelization of Islam; and desire to express our sympathy with the fervent desire of the Persian Church to be organically united.

We note that the Church in Persia is, for different reasons set forth in the Proposals, not yet ready for formal Union. We encourage the Church in Persia, however, to go forward towards this goal, carefully studying present movements in other parts towards Church Unity, and, in particular, the Scheme for a united Church of South India.

We regard it as essential for the Unity of the Church, that the Historic Episcopate, in a constitutional form, should be definitely aimed at as the Order of the United Church of Persia. By this we do not mean that it should be an Anglican Church; indeed, we hope that the Church of Persia, developing along the lines of its own genius, will have some particular contribution of its own to bring into the Catholic Church. But we urge that, if the Church of Persia is to be a vital part of the great Reunited

Church, it should go forward along the lines of the threefold historic Ministry of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, on which lines the Church is so clearly moving to-day.

We sympathize with the Church of Persia in its natural desire to be independent of external jurisdiction, and we look forward to the time when it will be completely free to develop according to its own national genius as a Province of the Church Universal. In the meantime, while steps are being taken to reach this goal, we gladly place at the disposal of the Persian Church all the experience that the Anglican Communion has gathered during the course of its history.

We have given sympathetic regard to the proposal that, at future ordinations in the two divisions in the Church, prior to the consummation of Union, two ordained ministers from the Northern (Presbyterian) Churches join in the Laying-on of Hands at the ordination of an Episcopal minister; and, similarly, that the Bishop should take part in the Laying-on of Hands at the ordination of a minister in the Presbyterian Church. We recognize that there are inherent difficulties in this proposal, but recommend that in view of the situation existing in the Church in Persia, due enquiry be made with a view to discovering whether some Scheme of Joint Ordination be possible, always providing, on our part, that the essentially Episcopal nature of the ordination be properly safeguarded.

The South India Scheme

It is with reference to the principle we have already set forth that we have considered the Proposed Scheme of Union affecting the southern dioceses of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the South India United Church and the South India Province of the Wesleyan Methodist Church.

First it is important to make clear the way in which this scheme came before the Lambeth Conference. It was not submitted for acceptance or rejection. The Lambeth Conference has no constitutional authority to accept or reject such proposals; the responsibility for action lies with the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon.[1] That Church has throughout fully recognized this fact. But before exercising its responsibility it has desired, in the spirit of fellowship, to ascertain the views of the Bishops belonging to other Provinces of the Anglican Communion, inasmuch as the whole of that Communion may be greatly concerned in and affected by what takes place. Accordingly, the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon submitted the Proposals to the Lambeth Conference, together with certain Resolutions of the General Council and certain expressions

[1] Cf. Resolution 11 of the Lambeth Conference of 1920. 'The Conference recognizes that the task of effecting union with other Christian Communions must be undertaken by the various national, regional or provincial authorities of the Churches within the Anglican Communion.'

of its opinion on special points by which it desires that its own delegates may be guided at future meetings of the Joint Committee of the uniting Churches, in order that the assembled Bishops might offer their advice. The Episcopal Synod further asked for such advice with reference to four specific points and communicated one other on which the General Council desired to obtain the opinion of the Conference.

Secondly, it should be plainly understood that 'the scheme is frankly an outline.' In its present form it is the work of a joint Committee on which representatives of the Churches concerned have been serving since 1920. It is an endeavour to state the central points on which agreement is necessary for union, for presentation to the Governing Bodies of the Churches concerned in India and elsewhere. No final conclusions have been reached on these central points by any of the Churches concerned. And, as the Joint Committee itself declares, even after agreement on the central points many details would still remain to be worked out.

One very important fact, however, as to the general position of the united Church[1] is impressed upon our minds at the start. We find in the proposed scheme a conception which is alike bold and new. The Joint Committee definitely intend that the Church in which the uniting bodies are to converge shall be autonomous in the fullest sense. It is to be free from any control legal or otherwise of any Church or society external to itself. The Anglican dioceses concerned are to be no longer a part of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. The suggestion that the united Church should from a new province of that Church is rejected, on the ground that such an arrangement would have the appearance, and even something of the reality, of the absorption of the South India United Church and of the Wesleyan Church of South India in the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. Those dioceses will therefore not be Anglican dioceses in which we are asked to recognize elements foreign to the Anglican system; they would go forth from the Anglican Communion in order to make their own distinctive contribution to the faith and order of the new united Church. Moreover, the Church in which those dioceses are to be embraced will be itself 'a distinct province of the Universal Church,' with a rule and character of its own. It is understood on all sides and is recognized in the scheme itself that no province of the Universal Church is free to act according to its own choice in contravention of the faith once for all delivered to the Saints or without regard to the preservation of the fellowship of the Church Universal.

From the position thus frankly stated follow certain results. The Anglican Communion consists of various Provinces and Dioceses in full

[1] The phrase 'united Church' is used to denote the Church that will exist if the Proposed Scheme of Union becomes operative, but it must not be taken to be the name by which that Church will be called.

communion with the Church of England. At the present time the Lambeth Conference is the visible bond which unites the different portions of the Anglican Communion to one another. It consists of Bishops in full communion with the Church of England and exercising oversight over Anglican dioceses. But the united Church in South India will not be a part of the Anglican Communion.

This does not, however, involve anything in the nature of schism, for even though the united Church will not be an integral part of the Anglican Communion, the fact of the formation of the united Church will not deprive any members of the united Church, whether Bishops, Clergy or Laity, of any privilege of communion which they have hitherto enjoyed with the Church of England and with the Churches in communion with it.

Though the representatives of the Anglican Communion assembled in this Conference are not ready to express approval of every detail of the scheme, they are (we believe) desirous that the venture should be made and the Union inaugurated, and they hope that it will lead to the emergence of a part of the Body of Christ which will possess a new combination of the riches which are His. In this hope they wish to stand by the Church of India while she makes this experiment with generous good-will.

We should hope that when the inauguration of the Union takes effect, the United Church will at once enjoy communion with the Churches of the Anglican Communion in the following ways:—

(1) No censure should attach to any member, ordained or unordained, of a Church of the Anglican Communion who may be in South India or go thither, if he communicates with the united Church or takes work of any kind in it.

(2) No Church of the Anglican Communion should establish churches or congregations in the area of the union apart from the united Church.

(3) If communicant members or ordained ministers of the united Church should go into any diocese of the Anglican Communion, the Church of that diocese should receive them to communion whenever this can be done consistently with the regulations of each Province or extra-Provincial diocese, and episcopally ordained ministers of the united Church should be qualified, at the discretion of the Bishop, to officiate, subject to the regulations of the diocese for its own ministers.

These provisions represent certain restrictions upon full communion, that is to say, upon complete interchangeability of ministers and complete mutual admissibility to communion. We hope that when the unification within the united Church, contemplated in the Proposed Scheme, is complete, full communion in that sense will be secured between the united Church and the Churches of the Anglican Communion.

We proceed to offer the comments and advice for which we have been asked.

We rejoice that those who have combined to draw up the Proposed Scheme have endeavoured to follow the method of incorporating the distinctive elements of all the uniting bodies, for we are convinced that this method alone corresponds to the facts of the situation.

We associate ourselves with the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, when it declares that it 'recognizes with great thankfulness that the Joint Committee has been guided by Almighty God to base the Scheme of Union upon the acknowledgment of essential truths and principles of the Christian Religion which the Church has ever held; namely, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and of the Incarnation of the Son of God, the authority of the Holy Scriptures, the Creeds as witnessing to and safeguarding the Faith, the two Sacraments of Baptism and the Holy Communion, and Christ's gift of the Ministry of His Church'; and also when it declares that 'it observes with equal thankfulness that the Committee has been guided to seek the achievement of union by unifying the Ministry through adoption of the rule of episcopal ordination; and it desires to express its grateful appreciation of the service which has been rendered to the common cause by those who have been willing to change their customs in order to make this possible.'

We therefore thank the Episcopal Synod and General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon for the courage and wisdom which they have shown in sanctioning the negotiations at various times. We know how closely they have studied the needs of the Church, and the local circumstances in which the union is projected. We are impressed by the very careful consideration which they have given to the Proposed Scheme in its present form, and are in general accord with the opinions and instructions which they have furnished to their delegates. We are prepared to encourage the General Council and the Bishops to continue to seek union, on the lines which their own Resolutions suggest, without committing ourselves to particular propositions or provisions in the Proposed Scheme. And we trust that under the guidance of the Holy Spirit such a union may result as may fulfil the desire of those concerned in the negotiations 'so to organize the Church in South India that it shall give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church Universal.'

In giving our general endorsement to the Resolutions passed by the General Council, and the Opinions expressed by it with reference to the Proposed Scheme, we desire to call special attention to the following points:—

(1) We assent to the provision that those who unite in acceptance of the Episcopate with the functions assigned to it in the Scheme

should not be required to accept any one particular interpretation of it.

(2) We approve the method of proceeding towards union by means of a pledge given in mutual trust, to respect the long-established traditions and conscientious convictions of the uniting Churches. Among such long-established traditions of our own we number the Preface to the Ordinal, and therefore understand this pledge to secure that the rule which the Anglican Church has inherited, that an episcopally ordained ministry is within our Church required for the due administration of Holy Communion, will be preserved for those congregations which have in the past been bound by that rule.

(3) We welcome the principle of the Scheme, which is that of uniting the Churches through unification of ministries so that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the united Church will be an episcopally ordained minister, and inasmuch as the actual words in the Scheme dealing with this point have been challenged as indecisive, we hope they may be so modified as to put an end to all doubt. Similarly we suggest that the words referring to possible exceptions after the period of thirty years, which are left to the judgment of the united Church at that time, should be so modified as to make it clear that the intention is to reach finality in the unification of the ministry of the united Church.

(4) We approve the method by which it is sought to commend the use of Confirmation; we assent to the provision that the acceptance of Confirmation should not be insisted on as a pre-requisite term of union; but we most earnestly commend the use of it, both because of its association from the time of the Apostles with the gift of the Holy Spirit, and also because of the benefit which it has bestowed on individual members of our Church and the enrichment which it brings to the pastoral ministry of the Bishop.

Certain matters were specifically referred to us by the General Council or by the Episcopal Synod of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon. With regard to these we offer the following advice:—

(1) It is pointed out to us that if the united Church comes into being on the basis of the Proposed Scheme, which includes the provision 'that none of the existing Churches should cease to enjoy such privileges of fellowship with other Churches as they enjoyed before the Union,' an anomalous situation will arise: the Anglican Communion will, at least to the extent already described, be in communion with the united Church, which will itself be in communion with bodies not in communion with the Anglican Communion. There is no doubt that this is anomalous. But we hold that as part of a movement towards general and complete union, to which the Proposed Scheme looks forward,

such a situation may be covered by the principle of 'economy.'[1] Accordingly we are agreed that the situation described by the General Council constitutes no bar to the Church of India taking such action as it may think right.

(2) On the question of Consecration *per saltum*,[2] our view is that while undesirable in the normal course of the Church's life, such Consecration is not invalid and in the special circumstances of the inauguration of the united Church is justifiable.

(3) With reference to the question whether Confirmation is a necessary pre-requisite of Ordination, we wish to say that the prevailing custom of the Anglican Communion is to require Confirmation before Ordination, and we desire to commend this custom. But, inasmuch as there has been great variety of practice in the Church with regard to Confirmation, and it has not always been regarded as an indispensable preliminary to Ordination as Priest or Consecration as Bishop,[3] we do not see sufficient ground for urging the Episcopal Synod to insist upon it as a necessary part of the initial agreement.

(4) With reference to the participation of Presbyters in the Laying-on of Hands at the Consecration of Bishops our advice is as follows:—

(*a*) We regard as legitimate the proposal that, in the inaugural service of Consecration, Presbyters should take part in the Laying-on of Hands, as we think that this would symbolize the full concurrence of the uniting Churches, the passing on to the Episcopate of the authority which Presbyters have hitherto exercised in their own communions to confer Ordination, and the coming together in the ministry of the united Church of the spiritual blessings previously enjoyed by the ministries of the several Churches in separation.

(*b*) With regard to subsequent Consecrations, we hold that the participation by Presbyters in the Laying-on of Hands could not, in any way, affect the validity of the Consecration, provided, of course, that three Bishops take part in the Laying-on of Hands; but we prefer that it be not adopted lest it should tend to confusion, and we would urge that, if it be adopted, care should be taken to make it plain that the Presbyters do not take part as Consecrators.[4]

(5) With regard to the question whether it is in order for Bishops to grant authorizations to non-episcopally ordained ministers, we

[1] 'Economy' is a technical term representing administrative action to meet a temporary situation without prejudice to any principle of ecclesiastical order.

[2] *i.e.*, Consecration to the Episcopate without previous ordination by a Bishop to the diaconate and priesthood.

[3] Cf. S. Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica*, Pt. III, *Supp.* Q. XXXV. A. 4.

[4] This would, as we understand, conform to the practice and principle of the Church of Sweden, which has missions in the area of the proposed union in South India.

suggest that the difficulty might be avoided if the existing ministers of the uniting Churches who will continue to minister in the united Church 'provided that they assent to the Basis of Union and accept the Constitution of the united Church' are not required to receive any fresh authorization or licence for that purpose, and if non-episcopally ordained ministers who are received during the period of thirty years are at the request of the Church or Society entitled to send them received without episcopal authorization or licence, the ministers in both cases agreeing to work under the 'pastoral oversight' of the Bishop; but the Committee is unwilling to condemn the action of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon if with its consent Bishops of South India give such authorization or licence to non-episcopally ordained ministers after the inauguration of a union agreed to by the Church, and in consequence of the exceptional circumstances created by the Union.

Having thus offered the counsel asked of us, we thank God for the signs of the guidance of His Holy Spirit as manifested by the degree and nature of the agreement already reached with regard to the Proposed Scheme of Union; we pray that the Bishops and other members of the General Council of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon may still receive that guidance in the decisions which they will be responsible for making in this regard, and that in the result the united Church of South India may by God's blessing be brought into existence to His glory and the extension of His Kingdom.

North India Round Table Conference on Union

By Rev. W. E. Tomlinson

For three days at the end of November there met in Round Table Conference at Delhi, on the subject of Church Union in North India, representatives, among others, of the North India United Church, the Methodist Episcopal Church, the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon and the Disciples Mission, and the Society of Friends. Two members of the South India Joint Committee on Union were present by invitation, Dr. J. J. Banninga, representing the S.I.U.C. delegation to the Joint Committee, and the writer, representing the Wesleyan delegation. Of the representatives of the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, two had been present at the meeting of the South India Joint Committee held in Madras from November 12 to 15, Canon Fisher and Rev. W. E. S. Holland.

Upon Dr. Banninga fell the main burden of the explanation to the Conference of the Proposed Scheme of Union for South India, as amended at the recent Madras session of the Joint Committee. Nothing could have been more helpful than Dr. Banninga's advocacy of union and his exposition of the Proposed Scheme. Perfectly clear, absolutely fair, and

not seldom impassioned, his addresses made a great impression on the Conference. One distinctly critical member of the Conference said in private that he found himself 'warming to the Scheme', as he realized the spirit in which it had been conceived.

If at certain important points there was little fervour for the Scheme shown in the sessions of the Conference, it seemed to us, the South Indian visitors, that as the Conference proceeded there was a definite increase of understanding of it, and the final form of the resolutions passed by the Conference contained little that is not either definitely expressed or implicit in the South India Scheme. We prefer our South India paragraph on Doctrinal Standards in Section III, the Basis of Union, para. (A), Faith and Order; but there is nothing in the North India resolutions on the subject which we could not accept heartily. So of the resolutions on the Sacraments, in which, it may be noted, the presence of members of both the English Baptist Church and the Society of Friends led to the inclusion of the following paragraphs:—

'(2) The difficulty of union between those who practise baptism by immersion on confession of faith, and those who use infant baptism and permit sprinkling and pouring, may, perhaps, be best overcome by applying the principle of congregational autonomy.

'(4) We welcome the personal statement made by members of the Society of Friends as to the possibility of their union with those who outwardly observe the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and desire to consider this matter in all its implications with a view to a more definite statement'.

These paragraphs are most significant and are the ground of hope which some of us may confess with shame we had hardly dared at present to entertain.

The resolutions of the Conference on Church Polity prepare one for the further resolutions on the South India Union Scheme. Here again there is little to cause discouragement to us in the South. The North India Conference demands, as we have done in the South, 'that in so far as is consistent with the proper order and due government of the Church as a whole, congregational liberty shall be secured both in the sphere of the life and activity of the local Church and in respect of its representation on the governing bodies of the united Church'. The episcopal paragraph, as might have been expected, is worded, 'There shall be superintendents or bishops who shall discharge such spiritual and administrative functions as may be constitutionally determined'; and a note is added, expressing the judgment of some of the delegates, that in the event of the ultimate adoption of the title 'bishop', it should not be understood 'that episcopal rank constitutes a distinct *Order* in the ministry of the united Church'.

What of the relations between the North India consultations and the South India Scheme?

'The Conference has heard with profound interest the report of the delegates from the Joint Committee on Church Union concerning the progress made in the negotiations for the organization of a South India United Church, and here places on record its sincere desire that through divine help and guidance the further labours of the South India Joint Committee may

issue in the ultimate adoption of a scheme that will truly promote the cause of Christian union in this and other lands.

'The Conference thinks that the South India Scheme in its present form would not be adequate to the needs of North India, and requests the S. I. Joint Committee to consider the proposals that there shall be a conference in which representatives of both South India and North India may consider together the principles that should be adopted in the formation of a united Church for India'.

We are profoundly thankful for the suggestion of conference between the North of India and the South. The matters on which the North and the South are in agreement are many, and all of them are of vital importance. It remains for us in the South, when we meet the North India delegates in conference, to show them by incontestable proofs that in the one matter that is in serious dispute, the episcopate, it is the episcopate in a constitutional form that is of supreme importance to us, and the supposed implications of the fact of historic continuity do not exist and need not be feared. God's wisdom and grace have brought us so far on the way to union in India that we do not doubt that He can and will do this last thing for us, a thing that not very long ago would have been thought impossible. That done, there will be nothing left to prevent a union of Churches affecting not only the South but the whole of India. To create a union of Churches in the South of India on an episcopal basis, and another union in the North on principles directly antagonistic to those supposed to govern the Southern Scheme is unthinkable. In order to avoid the conflict that would thus be declared and perpetuated, we must delay final action, as long as may be necessary, that in God's good time we may come to complete understanding of one another on the one matter that divides us, confident that if it be His will, the fuller union, less than which we can none of us desire or accept, will be brought about.

Round Table Conference on Church Union in N. India

By the Rev. A. J. Revnell, o.b.e., of Delhi,

Secretary of the Conference and 'Superintending Wesleyan Chaplain in India'

[From *Dnyanodaya*]

Making History

The second meeting of the Round Table Conference on Church Union in North India has certainly made history and will be looked back upon as a very important stage in the development of negotiations for union, not only in the North but for all India. This is indicated, apart from the decisions arrived at, by the number of delegates present and by the number of Churches represented. The Conference met in Delhi

on November 18, 19 and 20 and official delegates were sent, four from each in most cases, from the United Church of Northern India, the Baptist Church, the Friends' Mission, the Wesleyan Methodist Church, the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, the Australian Methodist Missionary Society, the Church of the Brethren, the Methodist Episcopal Church. The United Presbyterian Mission of North America were represented unofficially by three brethren from the Punjab and we also had the privilege of welcoming the Rev. Dr. J. J. Banninga and the Rev. W. E. Tomlinson as delegates from the South India Joint Committee. It will be seen that the Conference was much larger and more representative than the first held at Lucknow last year. Considering the number of different Churches represented and the fact that many had not met together in such a Conference before, it took a surprisingly short time for the Conference to find itself. This was due largely to the devotional atmosphere induced by the very inspiring periods of meditation and worship at the beginning of each session, when we were led in very real and united worship by members of different Churches. We proved, as was stated by Canon Fisher, that the nearer we got to Christ the nearer we got to one another, and that this could be accomplished by the Spirit of God. I do not wish to give a detailed report of the doings of the Conference. A full report will be published within a few weeks when all can give careful consideration to the resolutions which were passed.

All Ecclesiastical Types Represented

It is unwise to discuss findings without the actual text. I will only say that with every phase of ecclesiastical and theological thought represented, from the Anglican Church to the Society of Friends, we were able to agree to findings which will make a satisfactory basis for all to continue negotiations. This was the outcome of a growing conviction that God wills union and, however great and apparently insurmountable the difficulties, we must get together and keep together and work and pray until the Will of God is realized. The whole Conference was especially delighted with the presence of three delegates from the Society of Friends and still more with their personal statement that they did not see any insuperable obstacle to entering into a United Church in which other parts would observe the Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion. The Conference is anxious that the whole of this very gracious opening may be explored. I remember that years ago a prominent Anglican in India said to me that no United Church which could not ultimately include the Friends could be called complete, and I am sure that if the way is revealed for the inclusion in a United Church in India of these universally respected and loved followers of Christ it will be one great indication that we are under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.

Fears of Episcopacy Dissipated

There was on the part of several delegates some considerable fear of the episcopacy for which our Anglican brethren stood, but one felt that this was due largely to the fact that we did not know one another as much as we ought and that some had their eyes on the West rather than upon India. It was evident, for instance, that the conception of episcopacy which was opposed is not the conception of our brethren in South India when they accept the term 'historic episcopate.' The declarations of Lambeth with regard to South India and the fact that we now have an autonomous Church of India, Burma and Ceylon have altogether altered the position. I am very glad indeed that the General Council sent delegates to this Conference and that they see their way to continue the negotiations. It would be a very great calamity if we moved towards union in the North without them. With them, as with the Friends at the other extreme, it is true that they must be within and not without. The Conference was greatly helped in its discussions by the presence of the delegates from the South. None better could have been sent. A greater part of three sessions was devoted to their explanations of parts of the Scheme and to discussion thereon. It is hoped that at a suitable and appropriate time a Conference between the North and South may be arranged. The Conference was interested to hear of the conversations between the United Church of Northern India and the Methodist Episcopal Church, and, while expressing no opinion on the proposals, declared its approval of any efforts to realize whatever union may be practicable between two or more Churches.

Continuation Committee Appointed

It is felt that we can now get to work. A Continuation Committee of nine was appointed with instructions, among others, to arrange for separate Sub-Committees to investigate particular subjects, e.g., the Ministry, the Sacraments, the Government of the Church, Doctrines, etc., etc., and to prepare reports for presentation to a future meeting of the Round Table Conference. Mr. N. Jordan of the Methodist Episcopal Church occupied the chair of the Conference and the business was most ably conducted under his presidency. Let us all give profound thanks to God that such a Conference has been possible, that such a spirit of brotherliness marked its gathering and that all have gone away with a greater passion for the union of Christ's Church than ever they had before. It is now for this vision to be brought to the minds and hearts of the whole Church; it is now for the whole Church to pray without ceasing that it may be realized.

ARTH. J. REVENELL.

Church Union R. T. C. at Delhi

By The Rev. W. Hazen of the United Church of Northern India, Sholapur

[From *Dnyanodaya*]

Uniting India's Christian Forces

While the delegates to the R. T. C. in London are wrestling with the problems of communalism and are seeking a formula for the future Government of India, a Round Table Conference of Church Representatives met in Delhi on November 18 and the two days following, to consider proposals for uniting Christian forces in Northern India, and possibly for all India. This Conference was a continuation of the Conference held in Lucknow in April, 1929, but was led to take a wider view by the presence of delegates from South India, who were able to give first-hand information about the South India Scheme of Union, which therefore held the field in discussions during the most of the first two days of the Conference. The Conference was called by the Lucknow Continuation Committee, and included representatives of most of the bodies formerly represented, but with some regrettable omissions, and some additions which were very welcome. The United Church of Northern India, the Baptist Mission and Church bodies, the Wesleyan Methodist Synod of Northern India, the Methodist Episcopal Church, and the Church of the Brethren, sent delegates again, most of them four each. The new representatives came from the United Presbyterian Mission of the Punjab, the Friends, the Church of England, and the South India United Church.

South India Scheme Explained

The presentation of the South India Scheme was made mainly by Dr. J. J. Banninga, and was largely an explanation of modifications proposed at a meeting of the Joint Committee in Madras the week previous. These modifications at various points were made to meet requests and suggestions from one or other of the negotiating Churches. The statement on the 'historic episcopate,' and the denial of any official theory of it, is considerably expanded. The sections on the ministry have some changes, and also those on the powers of the bishops, and the method of consecration. The questions asked showed a thorough study and deep interest in the Scheme, and naturally tended to become arguments against one point or another, all of which were met good-humouredly by Dr. Banninga and the Rev. W. E. Tomlinson, and resulted in a much fuller explanation of details and of the general spirit of the South India negotiations than can be had from reading the printed Scheme. The special negotiations begun

by the United Church of Northern India and the Methodist Episcopal Church were explained, and the resolutions of the Lucknow Round Table Conference were also read over for information and elucidation of new opinions. All the materials in hand were then presented to a drafting committee to bring forward resolutions for adoption by this Conference. These were adopted in the final session. It was felt by some that more time could well have been spent in working over these, and in trying to work out some more definite scheme in outline for future organization. But the necessarily limited time assigned to the Conference precluded this. The resolutions were adopted in each case with practical unanimity and were as follows:—

The Resolutions of the Delhi R. T. C.

I. Church Polity

This Conference recommends that negotiations for Church Union in North India proceed on the basis of the acceptance of the following principles of Church Polity:

(1) That in so far as is consistent with the proper order and due Government of the Church as a whole, congregational liberty shall be secured both in the sphere of the life and activity of the Local Church and in respect of its representation on the governing bodies of the United Church.

(2) That authority and responsibility for the Government of the United Church shall rest in and be discharged by representative Councils or Synods composed of lay and ministerial members.

(3) That there shall be superintendents or bishops to discharge such spiritual and administrative functions as may be constitutionally determined.

Note.—In accepting clause 3 of this statement, some of the delegates wish it put on record that they consider it necessary that in the event of the title bishop being adopted, the term 'the historic episcopate' should not be introduced into the constitution, nor should it be implied that episcopal rank constitutes a distinct *order* in the ministry of the United Church.

II. The Sacraments

(1) We recognize that in the sacraments it is God Himself Who grants the grace of which they are the sign, and that this grace is received through faith.

(2) The difficulty of union between those whose practice is baptism by immersion on confession of faith and those who use infant baptism, and permit sprinkling and pouring may, perhaps, be best overcome by applying the principle of congregational autonomy.

(3) We are agreed on the necessity of order in the observance of the sacrament of Holy Communion. We recognize that the Lord Himself is the real Celebrant at His Supper, and that His Presence and the participant's communion with Him are realized by faith.

(4) We welcome the personal statement made by members of the Society of Friends as to the possibility of their union with those who outwardly observe the sacraments of Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, and the Conference hopes that further negotiations will show the practicability of the Society of Friends entering a United Church.

III. International Relationships

We are agreed that any Church resulting from an act of union must have autonomy in its own affairs. At the same time there are Churches represented at the Conference which have organic connection with Churches in other countries; and such relationship has values which should not be lost. Efforts should therefore be made in any negotiations for union to preserve so far as possible every such connection.

IV. Doctrinal Standards

We are agreed that negotiations for union should proceed on the basis of:

(1) The acknowledgment of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, One God blessed for evermore.

(2) The acceptance of the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as containing all teaching necessary for salvation and as the ultimate standard of our faith.

(3) The commendation of the historic-creeds known as the Apostles' and the Nicene as containing valuable statements of Christian doctrine.

V. The South India Scheme

The Conference has heard with profound interest the report of the delegates from the Joint Commission on Church Union concerning the progress made in the negotiations for the organization of a South India United Church, and here places on record its sincere desire and earnest prayer that through divine help and guidance the further labours of the South Indian Joint Committee may issue in the ultimate adoption of a Scheme that will truly promote the cause of Christian union in this and other lands. The Conference thinks, however, that the South India Scheme in its present form would not be adequate to the needs of North India, and requests the South India Joint Committee to consider the proposal that there shall be a conference in which representatives of both South India and North India may consider together the principles that should be adopted in the formation of a United Church for India.

VI. The Methodist Episcopal Church and the United Church of Northern India

With reference to the conversations reported as having taken place between representatives of the Methodist Episcopal Church and the United Church of Northern India, the Conference, while expressing no opinion on the proposals made, approves of efforts to realize any union that may be practicable between two or more Churches.

Solid Progress with New Groups and New Possibilities

It may be thought that these do not represent much advance over the Lucknow Resolutions of 1929. It may seem somewhat disappointing, for example, that it should not have been possible at this time to lay down in more detail the outlines for the constitution of a united Church. But the large amount of time given to discussion of the South India Scheme, though it prevented fuller discussion of proposals for Northern India, was not, I am sure, generally felt to be time lost, as it put us in possession of the latest authoritative interpretations of the Scheme. The participation of the South India representatives in this Conference showed that they were ready to consider the possibility of a wider union. It shows that the North and the South cannot work entirely on exclusive lines, if both have in view the future good of India. The participation of new groups, as the Friends, the United Presbyterians of the Punjab, and especially of the Church of England, in this Conference, shows also that Church Union in North India cannot proceed far without at least efforts to include in its scope all the existing Churches. While union of bodies already in closer touch with each other may proceed more rapidly, no union can be regarded as an ultimate ideal which does not include the whole body of Christ.

WILLIAM HAZEN.

Book Reviews

The Bishop's Office

Episcopacy Ancient and Modern. Edited by Claude Jenkins and K. D. Mackenzie (S.P.C.K., 12*s.* 6*d.* net.).

In the preface to this volume we are told that the design of the original editors, the late Dr. A. E. Burn, Dean of Salisbury, and Mr. K. D. Mackenzie, was to supply an exposition of the practical working of episcopacy at different times and in different parts of the Church. This aim is admirably fulfilled by Dr. Claude Jenkins, who has taken the place of the late Dean of Salisbury, and his co-Editor. The main part of the work contains accounts of the practical working of episcopacy not only in all the Churches within the Anglican Communion, but also in the Roman Catholic, the Eastern Orthodox, the Swedish and Old Catholic Churches. Careful and instructive accounts are given of the different modes in which Bishops are appointed, and the different conditions in which they have to discharge the duties of their office in various parts of Christendom.

In a resolution passed by the recent Lambeth Conference a description of the Anglican Communion shows how wide are its ramifications. In this book we see in what different ways its Bishops are appointed. In England they are nominated by the Crown, but elsewhere in the Anglican Communion they are for the most part elected by diocesan or provincial synods. The facts are set out as they exist in Wales, Scotland, Ireland, the United States of America, Canada, India, the West Indies, Australia, New Zealand and the Province of South Africa. Each contributor is either a Bishop, or some especially qualified member of the Church about which he writes. Accounts of other Churches are written by men thoroughly equipped for the task they undertake, but they are not members of the Communion with which they deal. The Bishop of Bangor writes on episcopacy in the Roman Catholic Church and shows how closely its Bishops are bound to Rome, Dr. W. A. Wigram, in his account of episcopacy in the Eastern Orthodox Church, recalls recent events in Turkey and Greece, as these have affected the various Eastern Churches both in their resources and their outlook. Episcopacy in the Church of Sweden, as well as in the Old Catholic Churches, is described by the Rev. C. B. Moss.

Three introductory chapters of special value deal with the historical development of episcopacy. Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke more than justifies his temerity in dealing with a subject about which there is so much diversity of opinion. In his essay on the 'Origins of Episcopacy' his thesis is that the Early Church at Jerusalem had a type of organization which in two generations or so became fixed in Antioch and Western Asia Minor and presently was adopted everywhere. He considers with special care the Acts of the Apostles, whose account of the ministry, he asserts, must be taken as a genuine reproduction of a primitive tradition. His essay shows careful research and the caution of a man aware of the complexities of his subject. If the reader still feels that the beginning of episcopacy is in fact hidden in the mists which hide so much of primitive Christianity, he may at least recognize how early is its emergence as the generally accepted method of Church order. The Bishop of Moray describes 'The Position of Clergy and Laity in the Early Church in Relation to the Episcopate,' and Dr. Claude Jenkins gives us a charming and instructive essay on 'The Medieval features of Church life' in an age which always repays attention.

The three chapters which serve as an introduction to the main part of the volume have their counterpart in the three chapters which follow it. Mr. H. N. Bate provides a noteworthy essay on 'The Continuity of the Ministry in Scottish

Presbyterianism and in Methodism, English and American; with an Appended Note on the Moravian Succession.' He points out that, unlike Calvin, the early Presbyterian leaders thought little of ordination; but they soon changed their minds, their successors being careful to maintain that the transmission of ministerial authority is effected by presbyters, asserting that this ordaining function of the presbyterate has its justification in the practices of the primitive Church. The essay recalls Wesley's decision to ordain some of his associates, as well as the events which led to the foundation of the Methodist Episcopal Church of America. Dr. Darwell Stone writes on 'Episcopacy and Reunion', setting out clearly and with persuasive force arguments which insist on the necessity of communion with a Bishop as the outcome and inevitable consequence of a principle which may not be abandoned if that which the Church's life absolutely requires is to be preserved. The concluding essay, by Sir Henry Lunn, has the title, 'The Free Churches and Episcopacy,' and discusses the differences which emerge between the ministry in episcopal and that in non-episcopal Churches. This is a book to be carefully read and retained for frequent reference.—*The Times Literary Supplement*, Thursday, September 4, 1930.

New Testament Ethics by G. A. Anderson Scott. (Cambridge University Press.)

Dr. Scott has given us in this small volume a very lucid exposition of the principles on which Jesus founded His teachings of morality. He rightly begins with the study of the Master Himself and the character of His ethical teaching. He shows very clearly that the Master's method was not one of external authority, but a very keen analysis of character as related to ethics. It was not a breaking of the Ten Commandments that kindled the anger of Jesus, but it was the attitude of the Pharisees and other hypocrites who pretended to be what they were not and who at the same time did what good men are not supposed to do. Selfishness, pride, vain show in religious matters and other forms of hypocrisy met with Jesus' real condemnation.

Dr. Scott also finds the same principles in the Apostle Paul who, he thinks, was actually present at the Crucifixion and therefore spoke of the significance of the Blood of Christ with greater depth of feeling than one who had not been present could probably have done. The volume is well printed by the Cambridge University Press and will be very helpful to those that want a simple and lucid statement on the subject.

Lausanne: The Will to Undersatnd, by Edmund Davison Soper. (Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc.)

Dr. Soper, now the President of the Wesleyan College at Wooster, Ohio, U.S.A., has given to the American public the popular setting forth of what took place in 1927. The book has several pictures in addition to ably written chapters. Though Dr. Soper cannot be called an unreasoning optimist with reference to Church Union, he does believe in that principle and believes that Lausanne greatly helped the cause along. His popular descriptions of the meetings and of the personalities who were present are very interesting and the book will therefore be a good one to place in the hands of those who may not be able to digest the authoritative Report of the Conference.

Moslem Mentality, by L. Levonian. Published by The Pilgrim Press, Boston, U.S.A., pages 245.

The author of this stimulating book is a well known contributor to the literature on Muslim thought, especially as it concerns the problems in the Near East. Knowing Turkish, Arabic, and Persian he is in a position to make an original study of the trend of life and thought in those Muslim countries. Being an Armenian Christian who has participated in the persecutions following the Great War his comments on Moslem mentality call for serious consideration.

Not only is the author eminently qualified to be heard, but the subject of this book is of world wide interest. The phenomenal changes in the Turkish government of late are only the outward expression of tremendous changes in Moslem mentality in the whole of the Near East. Here we have the most fruitful situation for observation as to what might be expected in other lands where Muhammadans dwell in controlling numbers. Indian Islam has points both of similarity and dissimilarity with Islamic thought the world over. What is taking place in one important section of the Islamic world must have its effect on the thinking of leaders of that Faith in all parts of the world. Christian workers in India interested in the Muslim problem in their land may very profitably study what Dr. Levonian graphically puts forth in this volume.

The first two chapters are contrasting pictures of the old Moslem mentality and the new. For the former, quotations are had from the chief Turkish and Arabic historians; for the latter, impressions are gleaned from the most influential and prominent leaders of the present day. Next, the author ventures a criticism on the evolving mentality of Turkish leaders.

The last five of the ten chapters in the book deal with the missionary problem of presenting the Christian message effectively to Muhammadans. In some respects this is the most useful part of the book for readers in India. In the past Christianity has not won large number of converts from the followers of Islam. Has there been something lacking in the presentation? Has the emphasis been put in the wrong place? The author thinks that it has. He would take all discussion out of the metaphysical and centre it around the ethical. He would emphasize loyalty to truth, the sacredness of human personality, the solidarity of humanity, and love in human relationships. While the record of missionary labor among Moslems is one of the most wonderful records of self-sacrificing love, I suppose the criticism is correct that the approach has been too much of a dogmatic defence of the Christian theological position. The religion of Christ has all to gain and nothing to lose by throwing the weight of its proclamation squarely on the side of the ethical. Space does not permit showing how Dr. Levonian would apply this principle to the various doctrines such as the doctrines of God and revelation, etc. Those who are interested are recommended to read for themselves.

The Bible as Literature, by Kathleen E. Innes. (Jonathan Cape, 6*s.* net).

Miss Innes is the author of *Mrs. Browning and her Poetry, Coleridge and His Poetry, The Reign of Law* and Dr. F. W. Norwood in his foreword speaks of her special qalifications for writing the book *The Bible As Literature.* She certainly has produced a book that gives one a new insight into the literature as well as the thought of the Bible. There are chapters on the Poetry of the Old Testament, Love Poetry, Ecclesiastes: A study in Pessimism, the Book of Wisdom, Characteristics of the Writings of the Prophets, etc. The book will furnish several hours of pleasant as well as profitable reading.

Microbe Hunters, by Paul De Kruif. (Jonathan Cape, 4*s.* 6*d.*)

This is a cheap reprint of Mr. De Kruif's famous book published only a few years ago. The author has given us in this book a brilliant account of the struggles, difficulties and successes of the early students of microscopic life. In addition to giving us the mere facts the author has put them into such an attractive form that the reading of the book is as interesting as most novels and one sees these diligent students, like big game hunters, pursuing their prey with all the zest and earnestness that men hunt elephants, lions and tigers and their quest is of infinitely greater importance because microbes are greater enemies of mankind than are the wild animals of the world. We owe a debt of gratitude to the publishers for publishing such an attractive book in so cheap an edition.

Unitive Protestantism, by John T. McNeill. (The Abingdon Press, $3.00).

Prof. McNeill is in charge of the History of European Christianity in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago. He finds that all through the Reformation Movement there is a unitive principle that is actively engaged in trying to bring together again the various elements in severed Christianity. He has found this unitive principle throughout this period of history and has given us a great deal of positive evidence showing that the reformers never intended to divide Christianity into rival parts, but that they sought to purify Christianity while they hoped to keep it united. Therefore the task of our day is to reunite Christianity on the purer basis which the reformers sought, remembering that their ideal was not a divided Church, but one that was ecumenical as well as reformed.

A Victorian Dean, A Memoir of Arthur Stanley, Dean of Westminster, by the Dean of Windsor and Hector Bolitho. (Messrs. Chatto & Windus, 12*s.* 6*d.*)

To many students of Church History the figure of Dean Stanley has always loomed large as that of a scholar and Churchman. At Westminster Abbey not only but in many other capacities Dean Stanley made himself a person to be respected and honoured. His influence was felt in many different avenues of life. He stood high among many eminent Victorians. The editors of this volume have given us a thoughtful and interesting review of Dean Stanley's life and while the book is not exhaustive it does give us a picture of this heroic character that enables us to feel his influence and to profit by his example.

In Pursuit of Truth, by Alex. Wood. (Student Christian Movement, 4*s.* net.)

This little book is an attempt to restate as simply as possible that view of the nature and method of physical science which while not altogether new has recently risen in the minds of many and has such a widespread recognition that it seems to be essentially true to our own time. This book tries to show us that there should be no misconception concerning the relation of science and religion, but that these two should work together in discovering God's full truth as revealed in nature as well as in revelation. A helpful bibliography is appended for those who wish to study the subject further.

Christian Verity, by Leonard Prestige. (Anglo-Catholic Congress Committee, Westminster, London).

Mr. Prestige in this volume sets forth his conception of God, Incarnation, the Body of Christ, the authoritative Constitution of the Church and other Christian principles in accordance with the Anglo-Catholic conception thereof. It is well that we should realize that the Christian Church of God has had a continuous existence from the days of Christ until now. Writing on the Eucharist Mr. Prestige says, 'No one can describe the manner of the process by which bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ'. Mr. Prestige has shown us clearly in this volume what he considers to be the correct interpretation of Christian truth and those who desire to know what the Anglo-Catholics believe concerning these truths will find them stated here in simple form.

The Bridge-Church, by Langford James. (Phillip Allan & Co., Great Russell St., London, W.C.).

In his introduction to this volume Mr. Sidney Dark speaks with ample praise of the work that Mr. Langford James has done in issuing this book. He commends it especially as setting forth the 'comprehensiveness of the Church which since the time of Dean Stanley, has been claimed as one of its greatest virtues!'

Bombay—Today and Tomorrow, edited by Clifford Manshardt with an Introduction by H. E. Sir Frederick Sykes, Governor of Bombay. (D. B. Taraporevala, Sons & Co., price Rs. 4).

In this volume we find an interesting series of addresses by men active in the life of Bombay City concerning various aspects of municipal problems. Each covers his subject in an interesting and helpful way. Such specialists as Mr. Bolton of the *Times of India*, Mr. Jeyakar, a barrister, Mr. K. Natarajan of the *Indian Social Reformer*, Principal Mackenzie of Wilson College and others discuss the special problems with which they are most closely connected. The final chapter is by Dr. Manshardt himself on Religion and the City. This volume will be a great help to those who are engaged in social and religious work in the cities of India.

Church Union—An Indian View, by Dr. A. J. Appasamy. (Christian Literature Society, 8 annas).

Dr. Appasamy has put together in this volume six addresses and articles that he has prepared on the subject of Union. Most of these had already appeared in a first edition of this book, but the second edition is enlarged by adding a paper that appeared in the *Hindu* and another that appeared in *Church Union—News and Views*. Dr. Appasamy has gone deeply into these questions and is trying to understand the whole question of Church Union and is succeeding in making a large contribution to the understanding of the problem and its solution. It would be well if all would read this very thoughtful and helpful volume.

Clippings

Archbishop of York's Frank Address

ON

The Lambeth Conference and Unity

(From *The Church of England Newspaper* of November 14, 1930)

The Archbishop of York, in his address delivered yesterday to the York Convocation, dealt mainly with the Lambeth Conference Resolutions on Church Unity. We give the full text of His Grace's important address.

As we turn to our own business as the Convocation of this Province it is natural that I should refer to the Lambeth Conference, which has met since we were last assembled.

There is no need for me to call attention to the Resolutions of the Conference. It is likely that some of them will, at a later stage, be brought before Convocation in order that it may be here decided what action, if any, is to be taken with respect to them in this Province. But it is evident that the two Provinces of Canterbury and York should move together, and the Bishops of the two Provinces are taking steps to see that these matters receive consideration in due order.

STAGE OF DEFINITE NEGOTIATION

But there is one group of Resolutions about which some general observations may fitly be advanced here, and concerning which I have some special responsibility, as having been Chairman of the Committee of the Lambeth Conference which dealt with the Unity of the Church. It is, I think, sufficiently realized that the Conference was concerned with advances towards union, both with the Orthodox and the Old Catholic Churches on the one hand and with the non-episcopal Churches on the other. In both directions the task was no longer one of issuing a general call for unity, but had reached the stage of definite negotiation. This accounts for the comparative absence of glow and warmth in the deliverances of the Conference of 1930 as contrasted with that of 1920. The discussions with the Orthodox and Old Catholic Churches led to the formulation of certain points of agreement, and to the suggestion that these should be further investigated by officially nominated Joint Commissions. The definite proposals on the other side came from South India; the Conference answered certain questions put to it by the Church of India, Burma and Ceylon, and gave a warm encouragement to that

Church to go forward with the scheme. It felt that in giving this encouragement it was making a real sacrifice, and potentially committing the Anglican Communion to further sacrifices in the cause of union. For by the provisions of the proposed Scheme of Union, the United Church of South India, if it is formed, will not be an Anglican Church. This no doubt eased the way of the Conference in encouraging the inauguration of the union, for it freed the Anglican Communion as such, from responsibility for the particular provisions that may be made under the scheme. But if there was relief on this side, let no one suppose that the Bishops regard, without the deepest feelings of regret, the loss from the fellowship of churches known as the Anglican Communion of four dioceses, with the prospect that, if this precedent is followed, other dioceses may be similarly lost to that intimate fellowship. For the fellowship of the Anglican Communion, with its bonds of common tradition, is a very real and precious thing; and it will not be easy in the wider fellowship for the sake of which this sacrifice is rightly made, to attain to a similar intimacy of relationship.

FREE CHURCH DISAPPOINTMENT

In comparison with these two definite proposals for action, the Conference felt that discussions which had not yet reached that stage were of less pressing importance. Accordingly it was unwilling to complicate the clearly defined issues raised by these proposals with less clear and less immediately practical issues, concerning which it proved impossible in the time at our disposal, to reach full agreement. As a result of this there has been an acute feeling of disappointment in many Free Church circles in this country, and I feel bound to refer to this at some length. As far as I can estimate the grounds for that disappointment, they are mainly these:

(1) The Report of the Committee on Unity lays upon the Historic Episcopate a degree of emphasis which seems to our critics disproportionate and disturbing;

(2) Both the Report of the Committee and the Resolutions of the Conference are thought to register a retrogression from the position taken up in 1920;

(3) No reference is made to the so-called Declaration of the Anglican Bishops who represented the Church of England in the Joint Conference, on July 6, 1923.

HISTORIC EPISCOPATE

(1) The amount of space given to the Historic Episcopate is easily explained, and is indeed explained, in the Report itself. The Bishops of our Communion have repeatedly put forward the four points, known as the Lambeth Quadrilateral, as a basis for negotiation with a view to union. On three points—Scripture, Creeds, and Sacraments—there is agreement sufficient for negotiation. One of the four remains—the Historic Episcopate. It was necessary, therefore, that we should explain the position which this holds in our proposals; and we had been asked to give a fuller exposition of what the phrase is to be understood to mean. This, accordingly, we attempted to do. We made it clear that our position does not depend on the result of controversy between scholars with regard to Church Order in the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Age. We saw no reason to doubt that, whatever other forms of Order may have co-existed with it at first, the Order which emerged as universal at the end of the second century had its place in the Church from the beginning; and from the third to the sixteenth century it held the field without a rival. It is, therefore, in the words of the Report, 'historic in a sense in which no other now can ever be.' This is the element for which we are in a special sense trustees for the Church of the future as we enter into negotiation with non-episcopal churches with a view to union. But the Report emphatically recognizes 'that those with whom we seek to be in fuller unity must equally safeguard the special treasures of their own tradition.' We are not offering an ultimatum, but a contribution to the general good. And the commendation of the South India Scheme is evidence that our ideal is not merely one of absorption.

IMPLEMENTING THE PRINCIPLES OF 1920

(2) Bishops who took part in the Conference of 1920 had no feeling that in 1930 we were going back on what had then been said. As a matter of fact, the whole of what was said in 1920 was formally accepted and endorsed by the Conference of 1930, and the leading paragraphs of the great Appeal were quoted in full in the Report. All who were present at both Conferences felt that in 1930 we were implementing the principles of 1920. It is sometimes forgotten that the Conference of 1920 gave no encouragement to Intercommunion, and expressly stated that 'it cannot approve the celebration in Anglican Churches of the Holy Communion for members of the Anglican Church by ministers who have not been episcopally ordained.' The lack of warmth in tone in 1930 as compared with 1920 I have already dealt with.

UNWARRANTABLE QUOTATION OF A SINGLE SENTENCE

(3) As regards the famous Declaration on the subject of non-episcopal ministries, I must ask leave to say that the difficulties which have arisen are mainly due to the unwarrantable quotation of a single sentence in isolation from its context. That sentence occurs in a Memorandum presented on behalf of the

Church of England Representatives to a Joint Conference of Anglican and Free Churchmen: these representatives were the two Archbishops (Drs. Davidson and Lang), the Bishop of London, Bishop Talbot, of Winchester, Bishop Chase of Ely, the Bishop of Lichfield, Bishop Woods of Peterborough, Bishop Watts-Ditchfield of Chelmsford, Bishop Linton Smith of Hereford, Bishop Strong of Ripon, the Bishop of Salisbury, the Bishop of Gloucester, Bishop Gibson, and Dr. Frere, now Bishop of Truro. The sentence often quoted states that the ministries in question 'are real Ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.' But the last paragraph but one before that containing this sentence ends with the words 'we regard them (sc. certain non-episcopal ministries) as being *within their several spheres* real ministries in the Universal Church.' And the very next words after the much-quoted sentence are these: 'Yet ministries, even when so regarded, may be in varying degrees irregular or defective.' It is in my judgment most unfortunate that the sentence in question should have been thus isolated, and not altogether just to its authors. The sentence thus isolated has been presented to us as a declaration on which we ought to act, on pain of proving ourselves deficient in sincerity. The action indicated was some formal act or permission of Intercommunion as a practical recognition of the reality of the ministers in question. But it is perfectly clear that the authors of the memorandum never contemplated such action on the basis of this statement alone until the other matters also dealt with in the memorandum had been cleared up. The frequent iteration of this fallaciously isolated sentence has obscured the issue. It is clearly futile to argue about the possible implications of words if those implications were not intended; union is not advanced, but rather retarded by such a progress. It is abundantly clear from the full text of the memorandum that its authors did not intend and would not accept the implications in question.

TWO THINGS HAVE BECOME PLAIN

Two things have, I think, become plain as a result of comments made upon the Lambeth Resolutions. One is that those chiefly interested in reunion between ourselves and the Free Churches had drifted into a misunderstanding because each was assuming the other to intend what, in fact, was not intended. We must recover full mutual understanding, even at the cost of emphasizing differences, before we can fruitfully discuss further the way to reunion. The other matter that has become clear is that the point at issue is not the claim of this, that, or another principle of Church Order, but the bearing of the whole question of Order upon the life of the Church as a spiritual society. The comments made show that our fellow-Christians in the Free Churches find it both painful and shocking that any of us should at once believe that God bestows grace upon them through their sacraments, and yet maintain that it would not be right for us to participate with them in those sacraments. This seems to point to a divergence of view so deeply ingrained as to be quite spontaneous between our respective conceptions of the place of sacraments in the life of the Church, and therefore also of individual members of the Church.

A PERSONAL NOTE

This is not the occasion for me to express my personal views on that matter, nor on such questions as to whether, and in what sense, I can myself accept the 'declaration' to which I have referred. I hope soon to have an opportunity of doing this. It has, however, seemed to me fitting, and almost obligatory, that I should take this opportunity of saying something about a matter in which my own responsibility was perforce considerable, and to point the direction which, as I think, our enquiries must first follow if they are to lead us to that union for which we all pray.

The Federal Council and Lambeth

A Shelving Resolution

'The Council does not consider it necessary or expedient to pass any resolution'

(From *The Christian World*)

The Federal Council of the Free Churches is meeting this week in London, and has under its consideration the decisions of the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference on the South India Union Scheme, the resolution allowing Bishops to give permission for Anglicans, in specified circumstances, to take the communion at non-episcopal Churches and the section of the Lambeth report that deals with the negotiations with the Free Churches on the question of Unity. In a letter to the *Times* Sir Henry Lunn supplies an interesting

report of a speech made by the Archbishop of York at the Continuation Committee of the Faith and Order Conference held at Murren at the end of August. The Archbishop, who was clearly on his defence, said he wished the Committee to understand the attitude of the Lambeth Conference in its desire not to adopt a sectarian attitude.

The Conference of 1930 (said the Archbishop of York) accepted the work of the Conference of 1920, and proceeded on the basis of the Appeal to All Christian People from that Conference to deal with certain practical facts. Their conversations with the representatives of the Orthodox Church became definite negotiations to consider the steps leading to immediate reunion and intercommunion. Dr. Carnegie Simpson since that Conference had declared his surprise that no pronouncement had been made on the declaration made by certain representatives of the Church of England in a conference with representatives of the English Free Churches to the effect that there are in those Churches 'real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church,' and said that as it had been publicly stated that the Committee on Unity was asked to make such a judgment he thought it best with equal publicity there to say that the Committee on Unity spent much time in the consideration of the matter, but it became clear that any decision reached would not be reached with universal good will, and would create an atmosphere of distrust prejudicial to the findings of the South India Scheme. What mattered at Lambeth was that they should have reached agreement with real good will concerning that scheme. For this reason no reference was included in the report of the Committee on Unity, or in the resolutions which it put before the Conference, to that much-debated declaration concerning the Free Church ministries. The vital principle stated by the Committee on Unity is that when union is already agreed upon many actions are permissible, and even desirable, which would be inadmissible between the same parties if they had not already agreed to unite. He felt that it was impossible to exaggerate the importance of the declaration that when union is agreed upon it is possible to do things which before such agreement must remain inadmissible.

On Tuesday the Federal Council passed the following resolution:—

That inasmuch as no business calling for any decision by this Council arises at present out of the Lambeth Report, the Council does not consider it necessary or expedient to pass any resolution on the subject at this stage. It instructs the secretaries, in the event of invitations to further conference being received from Lambeth, to forward such invitations to the Churches concerned, requesting their authority to resume conference, and with the request that their opinions thereon be sent to the secretaries before August next year, to be considered by this Council at its meeting in 1931. It further requests the secretaries to explain to Lambeth the delay which this course involves.

This suspension of further Conference until the Churches themselves have authorized the resumption of the conversations will, we believe, be commended by the Free Churches.

The Challenge of Lambeth

By Dr. W. B. SELBIE

(From *The Christian World*)

An 'Old Independent' wants to know what we are going to do about the findings of the Lambeth Conference on unity. He writes bitterly and in the spirit of 'I told you so.' Lambeth, 1930, *has gone back on Lambeth,* 1920, *and had we not better face the facts, drop dallying with episcopacy and get about our own job?*

I must confess to a good deal of sympathy with his feeling and attitude. I doubt, however, whether many of us in the Free Churches expected much more than the Bishops have given us, for it has long been obvious that very few of them were prepared to carry the findings of Lambeth 1920 to their logical conclusions. The net result of the recent conference has been to emphasize the view that episcopacy is of the *esse* of the Church and the only means of securing valid ordinations and valid sacraments. It has often been suggested in negotiations with Free Churchmen that they might accept episcopacy as a system of Church government without necessarily interpreting it in terms of apostolic succession and the transmission of grace. It is notorious that two theories of episcopacy—the evangelical and the catholic—exist side by side in the Anglican Church. In any reunited Church Catholics would be quite content if they could secure universal episcopal ordination, whatever interpretation might be put upon it by others.

All this, however, is profoundly unsatisfactory, especially as we now know that Lambeth has endorsed the narrower view. Free Churchmen know that there are very many Anglicans who entirely sympathize with their position and would be prepared to carry out all that was implied in the concessions of Lambeth 1920. There seems now to be

very little hope that these broader minded men will ever carry the whole Church with them. They have to reckon not merely with the Anglo-Catholics, but with a large body of timid and slightly reactionary Churchmen who shrink from anything which would seem to conflict with their exclusive Anglican claims. In this modern world these claims are becoming less possible and even somewhat ridiculous. Time is on the side of those who take the wider and saner view, and Free Churchmen can afford to wait.

In reply to the question as to what attitude we should take up in regard to reunion in view of the result of Lambeth I would say two things. In the first place, I am sure that we ought to continue to show the utmost friendliness to our Anglican brethren, and to be willing on every possible occasion to meet them, co-operate with them, and even discuss the possibility of closer relations. I do not agree with those who argue that now that Lambeth has shut the door there is no use in continuing conversations or discussing reunion any further. Both sides have still a good deal to learn and to teach, and the only Christian thing to do, under the circumstances, is to maintain friendly relations, to take every opportunity of better mutual understanding, and to co-operate heartily whenever it is allowed. We shall only make ourselves ridiculous if we stand on our dignity and, like sulky children, refuse to play any more. The time will surely come when the Church of England will have to take some decisive action in regard to the Romanizing practices of some of its members. It will be a great help then if there is a really good understanding among all the Protestant forces in the country.

Secondly, I quite agree that the Free Churches need to set their own house in order and to get on with their job. Perhaps the best contribution which they can make now to the cause of reunion is to cultivate closer relations among themselves, and take more active steps to avoid the rivalry and overlapping which are still far too common. I am afraid there is some truth in the charge that while we have lost much of the dissidence of our dissent, we have substituted for it a denominational self-consciousness which is just as great a hindrance to the progress of the kingdom. It is, of course, true that to each of the great denominations has been entrusted a witness which is still needed and which they are bound to give. But this does not justify any of them in assuming that the truth is with them alone, or in holding aloof from the closest intercourse and co-operation with others. The only permissible rivalry is that of zeal in good works and preaching the gospel. This is another matter in regard to which it may be doubted whether the Free Churches have ever quite risen to their opportunities.

We are accustomed to boast of our freedom. We should do better to make use of it. The conservatism of many of our Congregational Churches is notorious, and it is quite certain that if they are to hold their own in these days, to say nothing of making progress, they must shake themselves free of a good many hide-bound methods both of thought and action. The future would be with them if they only knew the day of their power. They and they alone of the Churches of this land have the elasticity and adaptability which would enable them to meet the needs of this modern world. But they need also courage, enterprize and an abounding charity. They can, if they will, show themselves equal to all the spiritual needs of the day, and Lambeth, 1930, should be a challenge to them to be up and doing.

Mansfield College, Oxford.

Whitefield on Union

In an article reviewing a volume written by Rev. A. D. Belden on 'George Whitefield—the Awakener', the *Manchester Guardian* quotes the following paragraph from one of Whitefield's addresses which shows clearly what his attitude toward the various denominations was :—

'When he was preaching once (says Mr. Belden) from the balcony of the Court House in Philadelphia, he cried suddenly, "Father Abraham, whom have you in heaven? Any Episcopalians?" "No!". "Any Presbyterians?" "No!" "Have you any Independents or Seceders?" "No!" "Have you any Methodists"? "No, no, no!" "Whom have you there?" "We don't know those names here! All who are here are Christians". "O! is this the case?" continued Whitefield. "Then God help me, God help us all, to forget party names, and to become Christians in deed and in truth".'

Printed and published for the Christian Literature Society by the Diocesan Press, Madras, 1931